

A3784

**Protest Trade of Tractors for Prisoners**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. PETER H. DOMINICK**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent proposals, backed by the White House, to indulge in a subrosa exchange of tractors for Cuban rebels captured during the ill-fated invasion of their homeland has prompted a wave of local reaction. Fully typical of the sentiment being expressed by the people is the telegram sent to me by the secretary of the Boulder County, Colo., Farm Bureau. Under unanimous consent I include this telegram in the RECORD.

LONGMONT, COLO., May 23, 1961.

PETER H. DOMINICK,  
Member of Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to vigorously protest the action of any group to trade tractors to Castro for the release of prisoners, and urge that it be officially discouraged. Aside from bolstering the Castro Communist economy it is making the United States ridiculous in the eyes of

the world. It is the feeling here that if our government feels they are responsible for these prisoners we should use force—not barter.

O. E. PERASON,

Secretary, Boulder County Farm Bureau

FOR EACH MINUTE ATTACHED BY A. H. H. H.

ing of the bill, there would be no further opportunity to amend the bill. It was undoubtedly concluded that, in view of the remarkable support which so large a number of Senators have displayed in favor of passage of the bill, throughout the procedure here in connection with it, it would do no harm to have the bill printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am happy to have the first copy of the bill, as thus printed, given to the one who has made its printing in this form possible. If I had the right of authorship, I would gladly autograph a copy of it for him. Perhaps he is the man who is responsible for this. Certainly the one responsible for it was not a minority member of the committee, because we on the minority side would not have had the bill printed in this way, I can assure the Senator from Oregon. We have some good bills in mind; but, as my friend well knows, ours would not provide for Federal aid to education.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot conceive of a more important bill in the interest of the welfare of the future of our country, in the entire field of education, than this one. But I shall find out what happened in connection with the printing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the fact that the bill has already been passed by the Senate, this day—for that is what the printed copy of the bill shows—probably we could proceed to take steps to vacate the order for the yeas and nays, which already has been entered, and let it go at that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That raises an interesting point. We might move to reconsider—in view of the fact that we now have in our hands the printed copy of the bill which is marked as having been passed this day by the Senate. Obviously the New Frontier has finally accomplished something that is really new. [Laughter.] Everything else the New Frontier has proposed was tried back in the 1930's, and did not work. I remember when Mr. Wallace wrote a book entitled "The New Frontier"; and in the first few chapters he said it was necessary to change the rules of the Senate. However, he was unable to accomplish that; and later, when President Roosevelt tried to have the rules of the Senate changed, he, too, was unsuccessful.

But now it is obvious that the rules of the Senate have been changed, for we have before our own eyes very definite evidence of such an accomplishment, in view of the fact that we now have received advance copies of what the new law is to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I point out that this practice is not an uncommon one. We have a very efficient enrolling clerk; and it is not uncommon, after the third reading of a bill, to send the bill to the Government Printing Office to be printed.

Usually the bill does not lie over for 1 day but is acted on immediately after the third reading. Therefore, it is sent to the Government Printing Office, for printing in final form, following the third reading.

So all that our efficient clerk has done is to follow the bewhiskered practice of sending the bill to the Government Printing Office to be printed, following the third reading of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me 5 minutes from the time under his control?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by stating that, efficient though the clerk is, I do not think he was justified in being certain that the bill would be passed by the Senate this very day, May 25. I believe it would have been better if he had not had that date included when he had the bill printed at that time.

#### *Cuba file* PRIVATE COMMITTEE TO COLLECT FUNDS TO PURCHASE TRACTORS TO BE EXCHANGED FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this morning my office was deluged with telegrams protesting the President's action in lending the prestige of his Office to the efforts of a committee of private citizens to collect funds to meet a blackmail demand from a foreign Communist dictator. I believe the unanimous tenor of these communications accurately portrays the indignation of the American people over any yielding to the infamous "tractor" demands of Fidel Castro.

Typical of these telegrams was one from Mr. Joseph Patrick, news director of radio station KRUX, in Phoenix, Ariz. The text of this telegram, which I should like to read, was in the form of an editorial broadcast by this station. I now read it:

Five bells ring on a UPI wire service teleprinter. Bulletin is double spaced between letters, a common occurrence in any newsroom—usually several times a day. The letters take form; words take on meaning, not just printed meaning but an impact that makes you wait for the upcoming words.

President Kennedy has called on the American people to contribute to the Castro tractor blackmail deal. An answer to a pressure move by a dirty, cutthroat Communist dictator is answered in the affirmative by the President of the United States. Before nuclear warfare, before aircraft were available, warbirds that so far have held even the Russian bear in check chained with fear of retaliation, another insufficient government had the gall to ask tribute from a very young United States.

An American sloop of war pulled into Tripoli Harbor, and tribute from a baby United States of America was easily viewable from shore. Open gunports in the side of the wooden vessel—the American hostages were freed.

Now, Castro's tractor blackmail is being honored with an endorsement by the President of the United States. It also became known today the President himself appointed Mrs. Roosevelt, Labor Leader Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower to the team.

Mr. President, why don't we simply offer foreign aid to Castro the way we have done to other countries who bare a few discolored, weak fangs at the United States? Why not offer civil service rights to Fidel? Why not even make a Government pension available to him if the U.S. Government would condone blackmail in the first place?

If we are going to buy the lives and the futures of Cuban nationals, why haven't we purchased the freedom of Catholic American priests? Why don't we free all those American troops still in Red Chinese prisons? Why don't we make an offer to Khrushchev—use some piece of America to barter the freedom of Americans, possibly B-29 airmen still held in parts of the Soviet Union from World War II.

Mr. President, why don't we stop backing up? Even if we don't prove anything to the rest of the world, at least prove to ourselves again we are Americans, afraid of no man on the face of God's green earth. KRUX hopes Arizonians at least will not be blackmailed by Fidel Castro.

JOE PATRICK,  
News Director, KRUX.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial of Monday, May 22, from the Arizona Daily Star, entitled "Billions for Freedom; Not One Cent for Ransoms"; also a column of Tuesday, May 23, by the noted columnist, Hy Gardner.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, May 22, 1961]  
BILLIONS FOR FREEDOM; NOT ONE CENT FOR RANSOMS

The offer of the Castro government of Cuba that the United States, either by its Government or people, trade 500 bulldozers for the release of a number of rebel prisoners, is one of the most insulting ever made in the historic dealings with hostages.

What it means is that supposedly we buy the release of a few prisoners for mechanical instruments or tools that would strengthen the Castro regime. That some of our do-gooder liberals have fallen for the offer is not surprising, but it is time that the people understood the seriousness of this offer.

It is brazen blackmail. It would set a precedent that would humiliate our country in the eyes of the world, if not our own people. Once established, it would soon be used more and more on some other kind of a pretext. Rich old Uncle Sam will always come across with money, or its equivalent, to buy off trouble temporarily. What a reputation to establish.

Let us remember the occasion more than 160 years ago when France was in trouble, and asked us to keep our treaty that bound us to come to her help, in return for the help she had given us in winning our independence. We renounced the treaty. France threatened, we answered, "Millions for defense, not one cent for tribute."

Our answer in this instance should be the same. Billions for freedom, but not one cent for ransoms. Once we show to the world that we can be blackmailed, others will try it. Eventually we will have to stop it. The best way is to stop it right now.

If President Kennedy refuses to stop this incident, he will go to his conference with Khrushchev in Vienna with a greatly weakened prestige. A man like Khrushchev will scorn such a surrender as a sign of weakness,

and possibly encourage him to show such contempt when he talks with our President.

This is no time for the Kennedy administration to show anything that can be interpreted as weakness.

[Hy Gardner Calling, Tuesday, May 23, 1961]

#### TOUCHING ALL BASES

It's an ironic coincidence that, of all things, Castro designated bulldozers as the form of ransom to free rebel prisoners. For the very name came from an old expression, predating the invention of the motorized machine, meaning bullying. You still hear it used in TV movies where the hero says to the bully, "Don't try to bulldoze me."

I suppose Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dr. Milton Eisenhower and Walter Reuther know what they're doing in supporting a public fund to subsidize the purchase of the 500 bulldozers. But if you want a private opinion we'd rather chip in our few dollars to help erect a permanent memorial on the prostrate hulk of the battleship Arizona in Pearl Harbor. I sympathize with the plight of the Cuban prisoners, but that is one of the misfortunes of war. I don't go along with blackmail; you never finish paying it and the best way to avoid it is not to start.

#### THE DANGER OF HOLDING CONFERENCES WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on a different subject, but one which is also related to our foreign policy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, from the May 21 Arizona Republic, entitled "Retreat or Victory."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### RETREAT OR VICTORY?

President Kennedy is climbing to the summit. Unless he intends to change radically present American foreign policy before this conference, we predict that Jack will fall down and break his crown and we'll come tumbling after. There is no reason to believe the President will not repeat the exact same experiences of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower at their various summits with Stalin and Khrushchev.

We don't know whether Khrushchev will offer the President the carrot of sweet reasonableness or the stick of threat and bluff. There may be another spirit of Vienna to replace the previous spirits of Geneva and Camp David. Or there may be another session of insults and vulgarities such as President Eisenhower suffered in silence at Paris. But it will be one or the other—unless the President intends to take the offensive to the enemy. Khrushchev is a thorough student of the Pavlovian theory of conditioned responses by giving and withholding goodies.

If the President, Adlai Stevenson (a summit fan) and Dean Rusk really believe that another test of Soviet intentions to help clear up major outstanding East-West problems will produce benefits to the United States, they are in for a disillusioning experience. If they really think that a new summit will produce any lasting agreement on any subject from disarmament to Vietnam, they have blinded themselves to the lessons of past experience. Khrushchev will, one way or the other, score another victory for communism.

After all, the President will be going to this conference after just suffering two major defeats—in Cuba and Laos. Twice he has talked tough and done nothing. Talking tough again—without making it perfectly clear that he intends to do something to back it up—will only make Khrushchev merry. What counts in dealing with Communists is

action, not talk. In the past it has been they who have acted and we who have talked—and they have won and we have lost.

But suppose the President should decide to change the rules for the summit this time. Suppose he should suddenly take the diplomatic offensive against the Communist enemy.

Suppose he were to leave Stevenson, Rusk, and Bowles home and take with him to Vienna the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Lemnitzer, Admiral Burke of the Navy, General Decker of the Army, General White of the Air Force, and General Shoup of the U.S. Marines.

Then suppose the President presented Khrushchev with the following proposition: The United States will discuss outstanding differences with the Soviet Union when the Soviet Union honors its past agreements with the United States. First they must fulfill their agreement made at the first Eisenhower summit to unify Germany by free elections. Next they must honor their agreement to permit free elections in all Balkan countries and Poland. Next they must adhere to the charter of the United Nations and suspend all aid to aggressive forces seeking to overthrow established governments in Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Next they must recognize the time-honored Monroe Doctrine and end all aid and pressure on Cuba. Next they must live up to the treaty of recognition signed by President Roosevelt and stop all aid and support of the Communist Party in the United States.

Of course, Khrushchev will not agree. But that makes no difference. He will now know our intentions. He will know we do not intend any more surrenders but do intend to force him into retreat. He will suddenly be on the diplomatic defensive for the first time since American troops landed in Lebanon.

If Khrushchev talks tough at hearing these demands, the President should treat him as Vice President Nixon treated him in Moscow—with icy politeness and uncompromising firmness. He should tell the Soviet dictator that instead of seeing communism bury us, we intend to see all captive nations free from Communist masters. He should also add that he expects to see Khrushchev's grandchildren live in freedom.

If the President of the United States, flanked by his military commanders, were to take such a position, it would electrify the world. It would light again the torch of liberty that has been smoldering in the dust since the Korean war. The hearts of the American people would be lifted in pride and courage and honor.

But this is, we expect, too much to ask of the New Frontier.

#### HOW NOT TO GIVE FOREIGN AID

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the May 16 issue of the Arizona Republic. The article is entitled "Chacon Tells How Not To Give Aid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### CHAICON TELLS HOW NOT TO GIVE AID

TUCSON.—The United States was told how not to disperse foreign aid yesterday.

The advice was given by Eugenio Maciel Chacon, newspaperman, printer, and farmer of Pesqueira, Brazil. He visited Tucson as a participant in the foreign leader program of the U.S. State Department.

The wrong kind of aid, he said, "Can be compared to a drunken Texas cowboy who bangs his fist on the bar and shouts 'drinks for everybody in the house—on me.'"

"Some patrons who are perhaps sober, laugh and say, 'Why not; he'll never miss it. He's a fool, but it is free.'"

"When foreign aid takes, that turn, it winds up making enemies, not friends, for the United States."

"It is like when the drunken cowboy runs out of funds, and the patrons of his generosity turn on him, and he gets thrown out of the saloon."

"In Brazil we want a lot from the United States, but first let me tell you what we do not want."

"We don't want free spending of funds foolishly."

"We don't want charity."

"We want to be investigated just as your banker investigates you when you ask for a loan."

"We want Americans to invest wisely with us, in plants, dams, and agricultural development. We want them to make a fair profit, to get their money back, and to deal with us in a businesslike manner."

"But please, don't send us the 'drinks for everybody' types."

#### JACQUELINE COCHRANE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a lecture delivered at Harvard by one of America's most famous women, Jacqueline Cochrane, noted first for her ability in the air, and also noted for her ability in business.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### JACQUELINE COCHRANE

You here at Harvard and I are the products of different systems of education. My school was more like Oxford. I understand at Oxford, at least for the Rhodes scholars, classrooms are pretty well dispensed with. The students are on their own absorbing knowledge from a varying array of available lecturers and then on examination day pass or fail according to their merits. Of course this may be only rumor or hearsay because I have never been to Oxford.

My school is affectionately referred to by the high-brows as collegio ictium durorum. My alma mater dispenses with cap and gown and books and never gives a sheepskin diploma. The motto of my school should be recited every night and sometimes more often. It is "Illegitimus Non Carborundum." We have many graduates but the number in recent years has decreased due to certain of our State laws dealing with compulsory education.

The seal of our school varied from campus to campus but always had the same three essentials: the black eye, the bloody nose and the flexed muscles.

I can tell from the look on the faces of some of you that you have forgotten your Latin. So I will tell you that collegio ictium durorum translates as the school of hard knocks and that illegitimus non carborundum translates as Don't let the — get you down.

The fact is that beyond the third grade I never attended any school except collegio ictium durorum. The hard way to accomplish anything seems to be somewhat in disgrace today in favor of the lush easy life. Therefore it may be presumption for me to address you. But my very old and esteemed wartime friend, General Doriot, asked for it so I am going to call the shots as I see them.

You have probably been considering such things as margin of profit. That's all very well and truly capitalistic. But if the margin disappears there is no profit to consider.